



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The excellent summary of the stylistic peculiarities of Tacitus, treated under two rubrics, "(a) Freedom to disregard almost any previously accepted canon of normal prose; and (b) a love of concentration which delights in the sharpest focus" is, if anything, too brief. On page 211 is a note tantalizingly brief: "cf. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall* chap. 40 . . . one of Gibbon's many imitations of Tacitus".

One general comment might be made on the notes from the student's point of view: more running paraphrases of the thought, and more examples of how to turn gnarled Tacitean phrases into English would have been welcome. The brief chapter on Tacitus and his literary Critics (xxiii-xxv) summarizes the best opinions concerning "the greatest painter of antiquity". If Livy is a Raphael, Tacitus is a Michael Angelo.

We must regret that, by a misunderstanding, the publishers issued the first edition before it received Professor Moore's final revision.

I cannot close this review without expressing my personal pleasure in reading this book from the hand of one to whom, as my whilom instructor, I owe my introduction to Tacitus. Refinement of phrase, discriminating criticism and sympathy with Tacitus I have associated with Dr. Moore from the beginning.

UNION COLLEGE.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

Sentence Connection in Tacitus. A Thesis by C. W. Mendell. New Haven: Yale University Press (1911). Pp. viii + 158. \$1.25¹.

This is a clear and convincing piece of work, well worth doing and well done. The idea that the rules and classifications in the current grammars and syntactical works do not satisfactorily cover the whole subject of the expression of thought-connection in Latin is of course not new to Dr. Mendell, who frankly attributes "the conception of sentence connection which underlies this work" to Professor Morris, as set forth in his *Principles and Methods in Syntax*. It may be noted in passing, however, that not all the Latin grammars are quite so limited in their recognition of non-conjunctive and non-pronominal expression of thought-connection as are those mentioned by our author. Fischer's *Latin Grammar*, for example,—a book, by the way, which deserves more consideration than it has received—distinctly recognizes three regular forms of connection of sentences, both in coordination and in subordination, namely, (a) syndetic (i. e. by conjunctions), (b) pronominal (i. e. by determinative form-adjectives or form-adverbs), and (c) asyndetic; he notes also that "logically every period in discourse

(except the first in a treatise, or in a new chapter) is 'connected' with the preceding period" (Part II, pp. 472 f.). And the non-conjunctive, non-pronominal 'connection' is occasionally recognized in notes on Latin authors. But Dr. Mendell is the first to investigate and present the facts in detail for a considerable body of Latin text, and he has performed the task with acumen and thoroughness.

As our author himself states (p. vii), his work "is not the exposition of a theory, but a collection of evidence eventually to be used in such an exposition". The affirmative part of this statement is unduly modest, for the "collection of evidence" is prosecuted with notable keenness of observation and discrimination, and the presentation of the evidence is accompanied by the clear and orderly formulation of statements of Tacitean usage, which in themselves constitute an appreciable contribution to the known facts of Latin grammar and rhetoric. Naturally, so considerable a body of material and explanatory doctrine (viii + 158 pages of closely printed text) cannot be adequately summarized in a few words, but the barest outline is as follows.

The general thesis is that there are many other means of expressing thought-connection in written Latin than by conjunctions and relative pronouns, and that these means are not mere exceptions, anomalous survivals, or rhetorical devices (though rhetoric doubtless plays a part here, as the author recognizes), but are "cases of one sort of sentence connection". The cases are presented in three main groups, with numerous subdivisions: I No expressed connection; II Connection expressed in the first clause; III Connection expressed in the second clause. As a specimen of the sub-grouping may be given a list of the contents of group III A, which deals with the expression of connection by repetition: (1) Actual repetition of a word; (2) Virtual repetition of a word, by means of a synonym, demonstrative pronoun, relative pronoun, etc.; (3) Repetition of an element of meaning, by means of another part of speech, a summary word, or a partitive word; (4) Repetition implied. Since Mendell's primary purpose is to demonstrate by examples, he naturally gives very many of them, and they plainly illustrate and demonstrate their rubric in each case, with clear recognition of the interrelations of various groups and sub-groups; but a very few must suffice here, as follows: *No expressed connection*: *Brevi deinde Britannia consularem Petilium Cerialem accepit. Habuerunt virtutes spatium exemplorum* (Agr. 8). *Anticipatory connection* by *sane*: *Novum sane et moribus veterum insolitum, feminam signis Romanis praesidere: ipsa semet parti a maioribus suis imperii sociam ferebat* (Ann. 12. 37). *Connection by repetition*: *Auspicia sortesque ut qui maxime observant: sortium consuetudo*

¹ The writer of this review had no part in Dr. Mendell's graduate instruction or in preparation of his thesis.

simplex (Germ. 10). *Connection by contrast*: Sic instituire maiores: posterī imitantur (Germ. 32). *Retrospective Connection by a word incomplete in its meaning, with reference backward*: Sic acerrimi Britannorum iam pridem ceciderunt, reliquus est numerus ignavorum et metuentium (Agr. 34).

The author's own conclusion (p. 153) distinguishes five results of the investigation, which (condensed) are as follows: (1) Tacitus is not confined to the use of conjunctions to express the connection of sentences; (2) numerous and varied means of expression are used by him, and often two or more means are used together; (3) specific expression of connection is often omitted, where the connection is obvious; (4) distinction between coördination and subordination is not sharply marked, etc.; (5) the means of expression of connection may stand either in the first sentence or in the second or may be divided between the two. Among the most frequent of the numerous means of expressing connection are repetition, contrast, conjunctions, adverbs, words of incomplete meaning, functional changes of the verb, and anticipation by the use of a projective word, a very general phrase, or a negative statement. Each method has many types, and the use of conjunctions or adverbs does not seem to be fundamental, but usually accompanies or makes use of other, more fundamental means.

As is usually the case with a good piece of work on a particular subject, the book makes contributions without the limits prescribed to itself. A good example of this is the detailed comparison of the uses of the relative and the demonstrative pronoun, on pp. 62-71, throwing light upon the nature and history of both.

A few minor points of criticism may be made. It would seem that either a slightly different title should have been chosen (e. g. The Expression of Thought-Connection in Tacitus) or else a working definition of 'sentence' should have been framed and employed. As a matter of fact, the relations of very minor clauses, as well as relations extending over broader areas than are covered by any ordinary definition of 'sentence', are both included in the investigation. No important results are invalidated by the lack of a definition, but the more or less indiscriminate use of 'sentence' and 'clause' is sometimes awkward, and various statements are less precise and satisfactory than they might otherwise have been. (But who would bestow censure for shrinking from such a definition?)

In the lists of examples only occasionally has one been noticed where the present writer would disagree with Dr. Mendell, e. g. *ipsos Germanos* (Germ. 2) and *ipsi Britanni* (Agr. 13), cited on pp. 11 and 76 as cases of expression of connection by repetition (the description of the *country* precedes in

each case). Is not the plainer indication of connection (transition from *country* to *people*) in *ipsos* and *ipsi*? and should not this use of *ipse* be noted alongside of the one presented on p. 59? Only one form of expression of connection not included by Dr. Mendell has been noticed by the present writer, i. e. *quidem*, to be included with *licet*, *sane*, *modo*, etc., on p. 29. Curiously enough, just after noting this possible omission, the present writer's eye fell upon Agr. 17 in Urlichs's text. According to the text which Urlichs accepted as the basis of his own the passage runs: et Cerialis quidem alterius successoris curam famamque obruisset; subiit sustinuitque molem Tullius Frontinus, in which *subiit* was an abandoned conjecture by Halm (now confirmed by codd. E and T). Urlichs adopted the conjecture, but, *not appreciating the connective force of quidem in itself* (helped out in this case by *alterius*), inserted *sed* before *subiit*. This expression of connection by *quidem* occurs in other authors, e. g. Livy.

An occasional awkwardness of expression or slip of the pen occurs. "Consecutive", rather than "contiguous" or the like, is regularly used in such expressions as "consecutive sentences". In several places this causes the reader a slight halt before he recognizes that the 'consecutive' clause of the grammars is not meant here. It is a bit disconcerting, too, in a work on sentence connection, to find such a loose 'connection' as (p. 155): "The change of mode in *adfici* and *claudi* mark (*sic*)", etc. On p. v (Table of Contents) "Anticipation" should apparently be "Retrospection", since this refers to the chapter on connection expressed in the *second* sentence. On p. 19 "The connection is *made*" and "*makes* the connection" should be "the connection is *expressed*" and "*expresses* the connection". The introductory paragraph to III A (p. 49) is confused and incomplete.

But these are mere trivialities—*velut si egregio inspersos reprehendas corpore naevos*, as Horace would say. The book is substantially good from beginning to end, and is a real contribution. It is particularly welcome to the believer in 'grammar to suit the language' rather than in 'language to suit the grammar or the grammarian', and it is another worthy exemplification of the soundness and effectiveness of Professor Morris's teaching and publications on Latin syntax.

YALE UNIVERSITY

J. W. D. INGERSOLL.

Homer's *Odyssey*. A line-for-line Translation in the Metre of the Original. By H. B. Cotterill. With 24 illustrations by Patten Wilson. George G. Harrap and Co.: London (1911).

Here is a truly sumptuous volume, superbly printed and charmingly illustrated, an ideal book for a